

MINUTES OF THE CITY COUNCIL

CITY OF AUSTIN, TEXAS

Regular Meeting

May 19, 1966

10:00 A.M.

Council Chamber, City Hall

The meeting was called to order with Mayor Palmer presiding.

Roll call:

Present: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer

Absent: None

Present also: W. T. Williams, Jr., City Manager; Doren R. Eskew, City Attorney; Reuben Rountree, Jr., Director of Public Works; Robert A. Miles, Chief of Police

Invocation was delivered by FATHER ED JORDAN, Chaplain, Holy Cross Hospital.

Councilman Long moved to recess the zoning hearings and set the hearing on Little Texas and the Parks and Recreation Report to the Council at 2:30 P.M. this afternoon. The motion, seconded by Councilman White, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer

Noes: None

Councilman Long moved that MR. RAYMOND ROARK be heard. The motion was seconded by Councilman LaRue. Roll call showed a unanimous vote.

MR. ROARK, Austin Jaycees, presented a proclamation for Armed Forces Appreciation Week on May 19th. Mayor Palmer read the following proclamation:

PROCLAMATION

WHEREAS, in honor of the individuals serving in the Armed Forces of the United States of America, the day of May 21 has been designated as Armed Forces Appreciation Day; and

May 19, 1966

WHEREAS, these Uniformed Defenders of America, in the tradition of "Faithful service to maintain peace in America and throughout the world", have worked unceasingly to fulfill the varied functions of military matters; and

WHEREAS, the efforts of these brave and dedicated men and women are usually taken for granted and their contributions throughout the years go unrecognized; and

WHEREAS, to honor the Armed Forces Personnel now serving and with past service, who are giving and have given their lives for God and Country in the name of peace not only for the City of Austin, but for the entire country, and to encourage acknowledgement of their contributions by all Austin citizens, it is essential that rightful recognition be given them:

NOW, THEREFORE, I, Lester E. Palmer, as Mayor of the City of Austin, Texas, do hereby declare the day of May 21, 1966, as

ARMED FORCES APPRECIATION DAY

and ask that all citizens join in giving due recognition to this group.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the City of Austin to be affixed this 19th day of May, 1966.

Councilman Long moved that the proclamation be adopted. The Council by standing vote adopted the resolution.

MR. ROARK, introduced GENERAL JOHN SCOTT, Camp Mabry; COLONEL WILLIAM MARCHESI, Bergstrom Field; COLONEL BEN ALLEN, 8th Corps, representing the Army; and MAJOR DUNCAN J. ROBERTSON, U.S. Marine Corps.

Pursuant to published notice thereof, the following zoning applications were publicly heard:

LOUIE GAGE	2207-2213 Anderson Lane	From "A" Residence To "GR" General Retail RECOMMENDED by the Planning Commission
------------	-------------------------	---

Councilman Shanks moved that the change to "GR" General Retail be granted. The motion, seconded by Councilman White, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

The Mayor announced that the change had been granted to "GR" General Retail and the City Attorney was instructed to draw the necessary ordinance to cover.

- - - - -

GAGE WESTERN INVEST- MENT	Rear of 7711-7725 Burnet Road	From "GR" General Retail To "C-1" Commercial RECOMMENDED by the Planning Commission
------------------------------	----------------------------------	---

Councilman Shanks moved that the change to "C-1" Commercial be granted. The motion, seconded by Councilman Long, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

The Mayor announced that the change had been granted to "C-1" Commercial and the City Attorney was instructed to draw the necessary ordinance to cover.

- - - - -

MAY B. BACHTEL, M.D.	1404-1410 Summit Street	From "A" Residence
	1504-1506 Elmhurst Street	1st Height & Area
		To "B" Residence
		2nd Height & Area
		RECOMMENDED by the
		Planning Commission

Councilman Long noted a question of widening Summit Street. The Chief of Plan Administration stated Summit was not 50' and it needs to be 60'. This dedication has already been taken care of. Councilman White moved that the change to "B" Residence 2nd Height and Area be granted. The motion, seconded by Councilman Long, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

The Mayor announced that the change had been granted to "B" Residence 2nd Height and Area and the City Attorney was instructed to draw the necessary ordinance to cover.

- - - - -

JERRY PERLITZ	3708 Kerbey Lane	From "LR" Local Retail
		To "C-1" Commercial
		RECOMMENDED by the
		Planning Commission

Councilman LaRue moved that the change to "C-1" Commercial be granted. The motion, seconded by Councilman White, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

The Mayor announced that the change had been granted to "C-1" Commercial and the City Attorney was instructed to draw the necessary ordinance to cover.

- - - - -

B. C. HAEHNEL
By Cy Miller

3301 West Avenue

From "BB" Residence
To "O" Office
RECOMMENDED by the
Planning Commission

Councilman Long moved that the change to "O" Office be granted. The motion, seconded by Councilman White, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

The Mayor announced that the change had been granted to "O" Office and the City Attorney was instructed to draw the necessary ordinance to cover.

- - - - -

BEN H. POWELL ESTATE 1008-1010 West 9th Street
By W. B. Houston

From "B" Residence
2nd Height & Area
To "C" Commercial
2nd Height & Area
RECOMMENDED by the
Planning Commission

Councilman Long moved that the change to "C" Commercial 2nd Height and Area be granted. The motion, seconded by Councilman White, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

The Mayor announced that the change had been granted to "C" Commercial 2nd Height and Area and the City Attorney was instructed to draw the necessary ordinance to cover.

- - - - -

MRS. M. J. PARR
By Frank Montgomery

606-608 Kenniston Drive

From "A" Residence
To "C" Commercial
RECOMMENDED by the
Planning Commission

Councilman LaRue moved that the change to "C" Commercial be granted. The motion, seconded by Councilman White, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

The Mayor announced that the change had been granted to "C" Commercial and the City Attorney was instructed to draw the necessary ordinance to cover.

- - - - -

May 19, 1966

ODILON RESENDEZ
By Richard Baker

500-508 Comal Street
1516-1522 East 5th Street

From "D" Industrial
To "C-2" Commercial
RECOMMENDED by the
Planning Commission

Councilman White moved that the change to "C-2" Commercial be granted.
The motion, seconded by Councilman LaRue, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

The Mayor announced that the change had been granted to "C-2" Commercial
and the City Attorney was instructed to draw the necessary ordinance to cover.

- - - - -

CHARLES WENDLANDT

1503 Fortview Road

From "O" Office
To "GR" General Retail
RECOMMENDED by the
Planning Commission

Councilman White moved that the change to "GR" General Retail be granted.
The motion, seconded by Councilman LaRue, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

The Mayor announced that the change had been granted to "GR" General Retail
and the City Attorney was instructed to draw the necessary ordinance to cover.

- - - - -

ANTHONY COLONNETTO

611 West 29 $\frac{1}{2}$ Street

From "BB" Residence
To "B" Residence
RECOMMENDED by the
Planning Commission

Councilman LaRue moved that the change to "B" Residence be granted.
The motion, seconded by Councilman White, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

The Mayor announced that the change had been granted to "B" Residence and
the City Attorney was instructed to draw the necessary ordinance to cover.

- - - - -

THE CHERRYLAWN
CORPORATION
By John Selman

6205-6227 Manor Road
6109-6115 Walnut Hills Dr.
6109-6127 Cherrylawn Circle

From "A" Residence
To "B" Residence
RECOMMENDED by the
Planning Commission
6205-6227 Manor Rd. &
6109-6121 Cherrylawn
Circle
NOT Recommended by the
Planning Commission
6109-6115 Walnut Hills
Drive
6123-6127 Cherrylawn
Circle

Mr. Selman was contacted and it was reported they were willing to accept the recommendation of the Planning Commission. Councilman Long moved that the Council accept the recommendation of the Planning Commission. The motion, seconded by Councilman LaRue, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

The Mayor announced that the change had been granted to "B" Residence for 6205-6227 Manor Road and 6109-6121 Cherrylawn Circle and the City Attorney was instructed to draw the necessary ordinance to cover.

- - - - -

CATHERINE NEAL, ET AL 2407-2415 East 19th Street
By Jack Ritter, Jr. 1814-1816 Singleton Avenue

From "C" Commercial
To "C-1" Commercial
NOT Recommended by the
Planning Commission

CATHERINE NEAL, ET AL 1812 Singleton Avenue

From "A" Residence
To "C-1" Commercial
NOT Recommended by the
Planning Commission

Mr. Jack Ritter represented the two cases as one, as the first application was heard and continued until the request on 1812 Singleton Avenue was considered. He stated MR. BENNIE STARK groceryman in the nearby area, was being displaced by the Winn Project, Urban Renewal, and has entered into a contract to build his grocery store at these locations, and to continue selling beer to go. The heirs of the family want to clear the title and sell the property. Mr. Stark is willing to put in the necessary drainage, and build a store on these lots and is asking for "C-1" Commercial on both lots. No one has objected to Mr. Stark's operation at his present location. Opposition was expressed by Miss Martha Mays, 2500 East 19th Street, calling attention to a petition filed in the zoning hearing. The community would like to remain as it is. MISS CARRIE WEBB, 1811 Cedar Avenue, asked that the area be kept as it is as there were many children there. Miss Mays was not in favor of changing the "A" Residence zone to "C" Commercial. Right of way on East 19th Street was discussed. The Chief of Plan Administration, Mr. Stevens, stated 30' from the commercial lot was needed for the widening of 19th Street. The Commission did not feel this particular use would generate sufficient

traffic where the burden would be on the applicant to dedicate the property, but they wanted to point out this was a thoroughfare street. Councilman Long suggested getting a commitment on a certain set back. Mr. Ritter stated if "C-1" Commercial were granted he felt Mr. Stark would work out something where the City would not have to buy a building. After discussion, Councilman Long moved that the zoning change be granted to "C" Commercial at 1812 Singleton Avenue and that the request for "C-1" Commercial on 2407-2415 East 19th Street and 1814-1816 Singleton Avenue be denied. The motion, seconded by Councilman White, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen Long, Shanks, Mayor Palmer
Noes: Councilmen LaRue, White

It was noted there was an indication that a set back on 19th would be worked out. The City Attorney was instructed to draw the necessary ordinance to cover.

P. R. P. BUILDING	2806-2816 Swisher Street	From "A" Residence
CORPORATION, ET AL	2900-2910 Swisher Street	To "O" Office
By William B.	802-820 Comanche Street	NOT Recommended by the
Hilgers	801-821 Comanche Street	Planning Commission
	2803-2817 Oldham Street	
	Additional Area	
	800 Comanche Street	

MR. WILLIAM B. HILGERS represented the applicants requesting a change of use of the area immediately behind St. David's Hospital and east of Medical Arts Square, to construct an 1800 square foot building for medical offices and laboratory in Medical Arts Square. There is no street through this area. DR. RAINEY stated they want to move in a prefabricated steel building to be used strictly for facilities and storage. There would be no additional traffic to this area. Expansion of the laboratory is urgent due to Medicare's coming in. Other development would come in later to replace this. It was their thought the City would develop the street; however he had verbal commitments from all but St. David's Hospital to dedicate the necessary right of way. He showed on a map the proposed extension of Oldham, inclusion of a part of the River Oaks Apartment lot, and the part St. David's would dedicate. Vacating Comanche Street was discussed. The Mayor asked Mr. Hilgers to meet with the Planning Department to work out something agreeable and satisfactory to all. The drainage could be worked out at a little expense to the property owners. After discussion, Councilman Shanks moved that the zoning be granted subject to working out the necessary rights of way. The motion, seconded by Councilman White, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

The Mayor announced that the change had been granted to "O" Office subject to working out the necessary rights of way and the City Attorney was instructed to draw the necessary ordinance to cover.

J. DON HOWARD &
DORIS R. APPLGATE
By Jim Woodmansee

Rear of 1600-1606 So. Lamar
Boulevard
1608-1620 So. Lamar Blvd.

From "A" Residence
1st Height & Area &
"C" Commercial
2nd Height & Area
To "C" Commercial
1st Height & Area
RECOMMENDED by the
Planning Commission

The Chief of Plan Administration, Mr. Stevens, stated Collier Street had to be extended from Lamar west to Robert E. Lee Road; then east of Lamar to Mr. Howard's property on the Interregional Highway. Mr. Stevens asked if Mr. Howard would meet with Mr. Rountree and him and possibly work out a trade. Mr. Howard made a complaint about a lay-down curb placed without his knowledge for a 50' street. Now the street is proposed for 70'. He suggested that the Humble Company be contacted and asked to give some property, keeping the proposed street in the center of the curb already laid then he would be willing to discuss a trade. After discussion, Councilman White moved to grant the zoning subject to the right of way being worked out. The motion, seconded by Councilman Shanks, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

The Mayor announced that the change had been granted to "C" Commercial 1st Height and Area subject to the right of way being worked out, and the City Attorney was instructed to draw the necessary ordinance to cover.

- - - - -

GEORGE K. HOOPER &
JIMMIE WALLACE
By Grigsby and Co.

1601-1605 Shoalcreek
Boulevard

From "O" Office 1st
Height & Area
To "O" Office 2nd
Height & Area
RECOMMENDED by the
Planning Commission

MR. DICK BAKER represented the applicants and described the property. The requested change of zoning to 2nd Height and Area was to classify their construction as an apartment hotel, where 38 or 39 units could be constructed. Although the zoning in the immediate area is practically all "O" Office 1st Height and Area, the surrounding properties were zoned 2nd Height and Area. 15th Street will cut off two or three of the lots presently served by the small portion of Shoal Creek, resulting in Shoal Creek's being a dead end street with a cul de sac. Although the maps show a 70' right of way, it had been stated part of it extended over the bluff towards Lamar. If the street is widened to the west the City would have to fill in the bluff; if it goes to the east it could be widened without difficulty. If the "O" Office 1st Height and Area is used for an office, a 30,000 square foot building could be erected, and 100 parking spaces would be required. Under "O" Office 2nd Height and Area for an apartment, the density and use of the street would require less off street parking than would need to be provided under the present zoning. Their proposal for the apartment hotel would require 63 or 65 parking spaces. All the way through, 15th Street has

May 19, 1966

the 2nd Height and Area classification, and this would be a logical extension of zoning to go 2nd Height and Area on 15th Street. MR. FRANK KNIGHT represented the owner of the adjoining property. The terrain of the property would preclude building a 30,000 square foot apartment. The right of way is west of the present street. He asked the Council to look at the access to Shoal Creek and the parking situation and refer this back to the Planning Commission. If it is the desire of the Commission to zone this property, he would like for his property to be zoned at this time to 2nd Height and Area, although it is not good zoning. Mr. Knight stated the apartment could be built at such height and it would interfere with the view of their property on top of the bluff; but his main concern was for the adequacy of the street. Mr. Baker said they had a firm contract of sale on the property subject to the "O" Office 2nd Height and Area zoning and their problem was the timing. MR. BOB LANDIS ARMSTRONG represented MR. SAM DUNHAM in opposition to the zoning, stating 45' height could impair the view from Mr. Dunham's lot. If the apartment were jammed up against his property he is left with a diminished value of his property. If the property is improved, there will be sewer problems. He pointed out the hazard of getting into the Shoal Creek property from an unprotected left turn off of Lamar. MR. DUNHAM stated what was done below the bluff would affect the property above. The Mayor asked if Mr. Dunham would register the same objection if the Planning Commission recommended the entire area as 2nd Height and Area. Mr. Dunham has told prospective purchasers of his property that they would not support apartments on the hill as his neighbors were opposed to such. If apartments are raised up and block the view then they would want to approach the Council for apartment zoning on their property. Mr. Baker pointed out the difference in the height and area was 10'. It is not the height they were interested in, but the fact they could go from 19 units to 35 units. He said they would restrict the height of these buildings to 35'. On the back of the property there is proposed one story construction; and as construction is done on the slope, there will be only two story construction which would not exceed 25'. Mr. Armstrong stated if that happened, they would withdraw their objection. Mr. Baker stated he would contact the owners and obtain the letter regarding the change. Mr. Dunham said if they had some assurance that the height of the building would not exceed 35' they would withdraw their protest. The Council was going to make an on site inspection of the area. Later in the afternoon meeting, MR. BAKER stated in relation to the 35' restriction, he had not been able to contact Mr. Zidell, but his agent says 35' at the highest point of the lot, wherever that may be would be satisfactory. They would give the City a letter that no structure would be erected above 35' at the highest point on the lot. Still later in the meeting a letter was filed by Mr. Baker to the effect that there would not be constructed any improvements on said property which would exceed a height of 35' from the point of highest elevation of said lot, and that the letter may be taken as the applicant's agreement to such limitation; and that Mr. Bob Armstrong, representing Mr. Dunham, said if this limitation is imposed, their objection would be withdrawn.

RICHARD RESENDEZ

6300-6302 Felix Avenue
807 Montopolis DriveFrom "GR" General
Retail
To "C" Commercial
NOT Recommended by the
Planning Commission

No one appeared representing the applicant. Councilman Long suggested

May 19, 1966

that Mr. Resendez be contacted and that the right of way problem be explained to him. The Chief of the Plan Administration stated they would try again to get in touch with Mr. Resendez.

- - - - -

DEAN O. SMITH, ET AL	1520-1530 West 38th Street	From "A" Residence &
By Richard Baker	1600-1620 West 38th Street	"O" Office 1st
	3801-3811 Jefferson Street	Height and Area
	3819-3821 Jefferson Street	To "C" Commercial
		3rd Height & Area
		NOT Recommended by the
		Planning Commission

MR. RICHARD BAKER represented the applicants, stating the property is under option to Barr Development Company, owned by a number of local investors, who plan a combination shopping center and apartment complex based on the development of the new medical center and other enterprises in this area. The combination shopping center with apartments could be one, two story or three story projects with the apartment units on top, or two separate structures -- a medium-rise apartment of five or six stories and the shopping center surrounding. "C" Commercial 3rd Height and Area is asked so as to resolve the setback, coverage, and density requirements. Mr. Baker discussed the right of way problems, stating there were about 8,000 square feet the City desires from this tract. His clients were willing to dedicate right of way, but not \$12,000 worth, but would like to leave it open for discussion. Mr. Baker asked the Council not to take any action on this application, until it is decided how much right of way can be worked out. The Mayor stated even if he gave 25', he would gain on lot coverage. Mr. Baker stated after the right of way was worked out, he would ask to be put back on the Agenda. In the meantime the Council wanted to make an on site inspection of the tract.

- - - - -

SANTOS DOMINGUEZ	705 Valdez Street	From "A" Residence
		To "LR" Local Retail
		NOT Recommended by the
		Planning Commission

Mr. Dominguez appeared in his own behalf and filed a petition signed by neighbors favoring this change. Mr. Dominguez had owned the property about four years, lived there, and has operated a fruit stand for about two months. The Council asked that this be put on the pending list until it could go by and make a personal inspection of the area.

- - - - -

W. C. DYER

2318-2320 Kinney Road

From "A" Residence
To "BB" Residence
NOT Recommended by the
Planning Commission

MRS. DYER appeared in her own behalf, requesting to place a third unit on the tract, but the double carport divides the lot. There is room on the lot to put in the third unit and it could be added if it were not for the carport; and that requires a zoning change. Her neighbor had a number of units on her lot under a non-conforming use. After discussion Councilman Shanks' moved to sustain the Planning Commission and DENY the zoning. The motion, seconded by Councilman LaRue, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer

Noes: None

The Mayor announced that the zoning change had been DENIED.

- - - - -

MR. ED BRIDGES and MR. BILL TERRY appeared before the Council regarding the program of Mental Retardation and Mental Health. Mr. Bridges, Chairman of the Mayor's Commission on Mental Retardation and Mental Health, and the Committee were asked to serve as an implementation group. Their budget was set up at \$10,000, but it was cut to \$5,000 for implementation of the recommendation made by the committee. Today they are asking \$2,000 for the Mental Health and Mental Retardation Board of Trustees to help develop a plan that might be presented to the State and Federal Government. The \$2,935 is for the Recreation Program for all handicapped children. MRS. CHESTER SNYDER read House Bill 3, regarding the various groups and districts that may cooperate and contract with each other through the governing bodies to establish a Community Center. The Agencies in Austin desire to combine the Mental Health and Mental Retardation. \$15,000 has been allotted by the State for a Community Planner for 18 months.

Councilman Long moved that the Council make available the \$5,000 allocated and authorize the City Manager to designate and make distribution as follows:

\$2,065 to the Board of Trustees of the Mental Health
Mental Retardation Center (Mr. Will Garwood)

\$2,935 to the Austin Council for Retarded Children.

The motion, seconded by Councilman Shanks, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer

Noes: None

Mayor Palmer thanked the representatives for the tremendous amount of work they have done in this area. Mr. Bridges stated this City Council, and the Mayor have been the most cooperative City in the State. Since the Community is going to have to accept some of the responsibility of taking care of the mentally retarded and mentally ill, and he would be submitted a budget for next year for their needs.

Councilman Long moved that the Council recess until 2:30 P.M. The motion, seconded by Councilman LaRue, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

RECESSED MEETING

2:30 P.M.

At 2:30 P.M. the Council resumed its business.

MAYOR PALMER read a letter from a MRS. WILL WILSON applying for a 50 year lease on Town Lake. Councilman Shanks moved that this request be formally referred to the Parks and Recreation Board. The motion, seconded by Councilman Long, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

MRS. FAGAN DICKSON, Chairman of the Parks and Recreation Board, read a report on a meeting of the Board, MR. STEWART KING, Consultant and the proponents regarding the Little Texas proposal, and the recommendation of specific alterations to the proposal. If the specific changes are incorporated into a plan, the plan could be made acceptable. If the specific changes are not incorporated in the plan, the Board would not recommend its acceptance. The specific recommendations are: No area on the north shore of the lake should be used by Little Texas. The Board opposed the exclusive use of any part of the lake's surface in such a lease. The public thoroughfare (South Shore Drive) should be continued through this lease area. Neither the public property nor the shore line space in front of Mr. Kassuba's property should be leased to Mr. Kassuba or to Little Texas. It could be maintained for public purposes under a maintenance contract with Mr. Kassuba. All surrounding private property should be assured a buffer zone or green belt. The design, character, and kind of facilities and concessions, buildings, drives, etc., must be revealed at least as to concept to assure proper standards of development of Town Lake. Since there are so many unanswered questions concerning the Little Texas proposal, the Board recommended for this and for future projects that the Austin Chapter of the American Institute of Architects should be enlisted to assist the Council and be asked to recommend when and if a plan is compatible with Austin's best development potential; and that the City do its own planning of Town Lake public lands; and when it is determined that certain areas should be turned over to private development, the leases should be let only after competitive bidding.

Mayor Palmer emphatically pointed out there was no park land involved and no reference should be made to this property as park land.

MR. GENE SAUNDERS commented on the development on the south side of the Lake.

MAYOR PALMER speaking about the recommendation to solicit the help of the A.I.A., said it was his opinion when the Parks Board selected Mr. King and Mr. Taniguchi, the Council was told they were perhaps the finest in the Country to design this type of plan which they did from Tom Miller Dam to Longhorn Dam, doing an excellent job. There were a model, maps, drawings, public advertisements

through all the news media that the Council was in the process of adopting an overall comprehensive plan for Town Lake; the public was invited to a hearing at the Auditorium but only a very few came. He asked if it were true the public were not invited to the recent meeting of the Parks and Recreation Board with the Consultant, that all the plans, model, drawings, and presentations be set up again at the Auditorium at 7:30 Wednesday night, May 25th for a public hearing, and the A.I.A., the Greater Austin Association, and the public be invited to come and look at the plan and see if it is the type of development it wants on Town Lake. He asked that MR. DAVID BARROW be present to review the plan again. Mayor Palmer read from a policy suggested for Town Lake, which had not been formally adopted, but which had been discussed many times. There will be situations where it will be in the public interest to encourage development by private groups. There are a number of ways in which that can be done in revenue producing situations, for example, the policy may be to provide for limited returns to the City in the early stages of development of operation, increasing the returns progressively as the project is established and shows increasing gains. As a general policy, the City's benefit would increase progressively in relation to the time and amount. Each proposal should be financially sound on its own without recourse to subsidy other than the use of the land. While there may be encouragement in the early stages of development an operation through smaller returns to the City, such indirect subsidies as utilities, street paving policies, etc., should be considered in the evaluation of a project. The City Council would be the final authority to determine the extent to which burdens would be put on the City by development, but the committee should take this factor into account in the review of the proposal and in making its recommendation. (Recommendation from the Town Lake Study Committee)

MAYOR PALMER noted since the Colorado was harnessed 30 years ago, there have been no public improvements by the City in the way of capital improvements on the river. From \$100,000 from the Hancock Tract sale, about \$89,000 development was done in front of the Auditorium, but there is nothing in the next five year program for any kind of capital improvements on Town Lake. It will cost \$150,000 a year to maintain the Auditorium area, and beach areas. If the people want the beach planted in grass and trees and spend over a hundred thousand dollars a year maintaining it, this is what the Council would do. He was glad that some of these areas were indicated for development by private citizens. He would not criticize any one for trying to lease some gravel pit property from the City to develop it. All the land was purchased for the dam and Utility System from Utility funds. None of it is park land. There is 64% of the entire lake open to public use. The Mayor stated the public interest could best be served in many cases by private enterprise building facilities available to the public, as it will be 50 years before the City would be able to develop the Longhorn Dam area and gravel pit. He pointed out there was much misinformation put out about this lease, and he asked the citizens to read this proposed lease and then criticize it or make suggestions. He said the lease provides that the City can go in and audit the lessee's books, bank account, and even the income tax reportings. Mayor Palmer said the Council would certainly see that the City's interest is protected.

MR. ED MAURER, Architect, discussed professionally developed property in this case, but feared for other lake properties and possibly unethical architects' coming in to develop without a constructive review. He was in favor of the offer made by the American Institute of Architects to review these projects. He did not believe this would be a hinderance at all as far as Architects were concerned. He said it was not that they did not want Little Texas or Fiesta Gardens or Holiday Inn, but the City is in the area of a Master Plan, and it is working with the problems, and wanted to be sure that the citizens had some sort of control, through at least objective criticism.

COUNCILMAN LONG'S suggestion was to expand the overall plan which architects had drawn, and then offer the area for certain development and let interested developers submit what they have in mind and how much they would pay.

MR. EUGENE SAUNDERS referred to the Norwood property where it was desired to build a motel, and a group of South Austin people took it to court and stopped that development. Motels mean a lot to a City.

MR. HARRY AKIN referring to a remark in the paper, stated it was not meant as criticism in the usual sense of the term but was meant constructively. He had not scrutinized or sought access to the fine print of the lease. His remarks now were to the terms of the lease, and length, in that the primary terms shall be for 50 years beginning June 1, 1966, and ending May 30, 2017. The lessor grants an exclusive option to extend the term of the agreement and lease upon all the same terms and conditions for five additional 10 year periods, provided that the City has the right to terminate the lease prior to the exercise of any option granted or at the termination of any option period by giving notice to the lessee not less than two years prior to the expiration of any term, of its decision to cancel the lease effective the last day of the term.

MR. JIM SWEARINGEN, asked if the terms of the lease were available to the public. Mayor Palmer furnished him a copy of the lease explaining this was the first draft or proposal and was not the lease in the final form. Mr. Swearingen asked for a comparison of this lease with other leases. The Mayor stated Little Texas must have \$3,500,000 invested in 24 months, and the amount of capital invested bears on the term of the lease. Councilman Long pointed out Disneyland, Six Flags, etc., were on private property but this proposal was for public property. The Mayor said the same consultant for Disneyland and Six Flags was used as a consultant on this project. Councilman LaRue's comparisons were based on the value of the land using as examples the Housing Authority two acre tract which was purchased at \$205,000 giving an evaluation of \$110,000 an acre without water frontage, and the Bait House lease of 10,000 square feet, renting for \$100.00 a month, as compared to the value and rental of 146 acres to be made available to Little Texas. Another facet on value of the 146 acres would be on the revenue derived. He cited concession percentages in Dallas of 17 $\frac{1}{2}$ %, 15%, 15-20%, with only the land furnished the concessionaire. The Austin Live Stock Show operates a carnival in conjunction with the show and the ground rent is based on 30% of the gross revenue of the carnival. A Galveston concession on the beach pays 30% of gross sales to the City of Galveston which furnishes the land, and no improvements. He said all of these indicated there was no comparison with the proposal submitted by Little Texas.

In discussion with Mr. Swearingen, Mayor Palmer said the City paid \$200,000 for the land under consideration. The Little Texas projection shows a return to the City of \$165,000 in gate receipts and concessions the first year. It is anticipated the receipts will reach \$200,000 and \$300,000 a year, plus taxes, utilities, etc. Councilman Shanks pointed out this was a tremendous industry, and one that other cities would be seeking. Mr. Swearingen contended the public had not been informed as to what was taking place.

The bankruptcy clause of the lease was discussed and read. MR. KRUEGER brought up the discussion on the recovery clause, and Councilman LaRue reviewed his discussion of last week, explaining according to the projections, the ten times the gross sales might amount to \$100,000,000 the City would have to pay to recover the property in five years.

May 19, 1966

MR. DAVID BARROW stated the Town Lake Committee recommended that some of the area on Town Lake be developed by private individuals or corporations. He suggested a project of this magnitude and the use of the lake be carefully considered. Mayor Palmer pointed out the original banks of the river are identified, and the area requested to be leased consists of 26 acres of gravel pit, 40 acres across Pleasant Valley Road, and 60 acres of water that has been excavated land, and that water is not in the main body of the lake. Mr. Barrow suggested the public should be advised about the terms of a lease as this; that expert advice should be sought in this field as well as in the design area, and the A.I.A. group easily could be worked into this. In answer to the Mayor's question, Mr. Barrow stated he did not feel that all public land should be retained just to be open to the public.

MRS. HAMILTON LOWE said if the 64% open area on this lake shrinks now with this industry, that somewhere some areas of open land should be kept for future generations. Mayor Palmer said Austin had 3200 acres of park land, and within a few years there will be a lake 10 times the size of Town Lake, with 6000 acres surrounding it.

MR. IRVING RAVEL, member of the Parks and Recreation Board, discussed the business aspect of the proposed lease and the return, and suggested consultation and research as to what a fair return on the land would be. The Mayor pointed out the amount to be invested and the estimated returns. Councilman Long feared the promoters would take this property for speculation, and the Mayor referred to the portion of the lease regarding this aspect. Mr. Ravel said if the promoters estimate a return up to \$200,000 a year, the City should have a guarantee of perhaps half that amount, \$100,000.

As to the value of the land, Councilman Shanks inquired if Mr. Montgomery's clients paid anything near the \$4,000,000 mentioned, for their property. Mr. Montgomery said they paid \$6,750 per acre for the first tract and \$6,250 for the other.

MR. FRANK MONTGOMERY, representing Mr. Kassuba who had a multi-million dollar project, said they would accept the recommendation of the Parks Board insofar as it affects their interests--that the beach in front be kept open, and the buffer zone be provided around the project. He believed an agreement to minimize their economic loss could be worked out with the Little Texas people. He said the three alternatives were acceptable to his clients--if the Council grants this lease to Little Texas subject to an agreement worked out with Mr. Kassuba; if the recommendation of the Parks Board is accepted; if the Council does not accept the lease proposition, and everything remains status quo. Mr. Kassuba is concerned about Lake Shore Boulevard and the ultimate route which it will take, and he did not want this 200' boulevard for which he gave \$70,000 worth of property to dead-end at the end of his property.

MR. TRUEMAN O'QUINN suggested the Council compare leases similar to this on property elsewhere that was City owned; opening such development up for competitive bids; and noting it seemed that portions of the property would be in the bed and banks of the river and part on the sand beach reserve. The City Manager stated there was no part in the bed of the river. The City Attorney explained the status of all property involved--part being a gravel pit, to which the City of Austin does not have title yet. Mr. O'Quinn discussed the sand beach reserve, questioning tying into a lease any property acquired for public purposes. He agreed with the recommendation of the Parks Board, and stated many areas would

have to be developed by private enterprise, but it should be done in an orderly system and on a competitive basis.

MRS. DICKSON discussed parking on the north side. Councilman LaRue read Section 11 of the Fiesta Gardens' lease. MR. EDMUNDS TRAVIS opposed the City's following a general policy of leasing to private individuals; but if public property is leased, everybody should have a chance to bid on it. Councilman Long stated generally public property should be saved for the public, but the City could not develop it completely with the money available and it is going to have to let some concessionaires have grants or put it on a competitive basis. This would have to be done on Decker Lake. This proposal is taking far too much, and with the limited amount of water front, she could not vote for this.

COUNCILMAN WHITE expressed opposition to the lease stating it takes time to study this type of proposal.

COUNCILMAN LARUE stated he could not vote for this proposal, giving an example of the City's having only 100' of public access on Lake Austin except at City Park. Today there is ample frontage on Town Lake as there was 25 years ago on Lake Austin. Projecting this situation 25 years, the same thing might occur as evidenced by what is available on Lake Austin. He stated it had been indicated under some circumstances greater percentages were given to leasing authorities because of the construction of the facilities themselves. He named three concessions at Six Flags--NAYLOR RESTAURANT, EL CHICO, and SMITH ICE CREAM COMPANY who furnished their own buildings, machinery, and employees, and Six Flags receives from 15% to 18% of the gross sales and the only thing the Six Flags operation furnishes is the land. Six Flags gets almost the identical amount from these three concessions as has been offered by Little Texas.

MR. C. B. SMITH hoped that no impression would be left that Austin had no plan or adequate plans, or that it does not want more payrolls. He personally wanted to see the property put to some type of use other than just for a little fishing and picnicking. He hoped Austin would not pass up an opportunity like this; and after more study and if possible in the interests of the City, something should be done.

MR. M. D. HALL wanted to study the abstract to the property to see who owned the land and how much was involved. MR. C. E. GUSTAFSON hoped the Council would not cut the proponents off, as he wanted to use whatever agreement worked out as a yardstick for himself. MAYOR PALMER stated no action should be taken without a public hearing. MR. SWEARINGEN said he did not think anyone was attacking locating the project here, and asked the Mayor what he recommended that these people submit that would be acceptable. Mayor Palmer said the first decision was, is there any area of even encouraging these kinds of operations in Austin. Councilman LaRue stated the percentages quoted from all over the state would indicate the going rate of percentages. MRS. AKERS referred to Councilman LaRue's statements about the recovery clause, and the small percentages; and MR. AKIN'S article in the paper, and her suggestion was that Town Lake, the entrance to the City, should be its show case. MAYOR PALMER read from the September 14, 1965 Minutes of the Parks Board regarding land for Little Texas--not the same location--but the same general concept, in that the Parks and Recreation Board expressed a favorable interest in this project but could do nothing until something concrete was proposed. Mr. O'Quinn suggested that the Council not end all negotiations and leave the doors open for compromise whereby the lake could be developed. Mr. Akin stated it would be very regrettable if this meeting should adjourn on frustration or over sensitivity. He did not believe there was opposition to some sort

of development. He would like to see an outstanding sort of program, but it could best be accomplished by careful planning. He hoped the matter would be held in abeyance and a note of finality not be attached. Councilman Long stated what was before the Council should be accepted or rejected, they could start over, this be planned from a different angle, and let other people have an opportunity to bid also.

MR. BUFORD STEWART welcomed an opportunity to attend a larger meeting where more citizens could come and listen to a discussion as this is something to be considered seriously. He thought this proposal could be something Austin would be proud to have, and would be a good utilization of the land, and there should be some study before it is thrown out. MR. TOM JACKSON said he would like to have acreage on the lake where his family could go; but at the same time if they have a gold mine out of a gravel pit, he believed there would be a gross misconception not to consider that.

MAYOR PALMER said it was the thought that the recommendation of the Parks and Recreation Board was to be received, and he had not thought they were going to vote on the proposal today, but have more time to study it. He pointed out this was a proposed lease, and should be explored. He stated the public still should be asked to review the Town Lake Plan, and then have the opportunity to see if they wanted to retain all of it for public use or if they wanted to lease part of it. He hoped the Council would give the public another chance to see the plans, before they made a decision. A lot of money was spend on the plan, and it should be made available before final action is taken.

Following is the recommendation of the Parks and Recreation Board.

"Austin, Texas
May 19, 1966

"TO: The Honorable Mayor and City Council Members.

"The Parks and Recreation Board has reviewed the proposal of the Little Texas Group as referred to it by you at your meeting last Thursday. We solicited the services of Mr. Stewart King of San Antonio, who is one of the original Town Lake Planners, to advise with us in reviewing this proposal.

"The preliminary sketch which was submitted to us cannot be called a plan. There are so many unanswered questions concerning legality, zoning, and engineering that the project will need further analysis by some city agency as a plan is developed.

"The Parks and Recreation Board did recommend some specific alterations to the proposal as it was presented to us on Tuesday. If these specific changes are incorporated into a plan, it is our opinion that a plan could be made acceptable. If these specific changes are not incorporated in the plan we would not recommend its acceptance.

"The specific recommendations are these:

"1. No area on the North Shore of the lake should be used. It is our opinion that all of this area will be needed for public recreation. Plans showing such use for it have been presented to the Council and we understood approved.

"2. We oppose the exclusive use of any part of the lake's surface in the lease.

"3. The public thoroughfare which is shown as South Shore Drive must be continued on through this leased area and to the east.

"4. We think that neither the public park space nor the shore lines in front of Mr. Kassuba's property should be leased to Mr. Kassuba or to Little Texas. It could be maintained as a public park under a maintenance contract with Mr. Kassuba.

"5. Mr. Kassuba protested the deflating effect of this type of development adjacent to his property, so we believe that all surrounding private property should be assured a buffer zone or green belt in order that its future development will not be jeopardized.

"6. The design, character and kind of other facilities and concessions, buildings, rides, etc., must be completely revealed at least as to concept to be assured of the proper standard of development of Town Lake. The only specific on the drawing we saw was for the skyride.

We have understood that we are not to concern ourselves as a Board with the terms of leases while we are considering the "pros" and "cons" of public land use by private commercial interests. However, to render a reasonable judgment on the use of public lands without understanding for how many years such land will be excluded from public use is impossible.

"To give a free rein to anyone to develop the public lands and Town Lake shores without the most competent planning supervision would not be responsibly guarding the public's interests.

"Since there are still so many unanswered questions concerning the Little Texas proposal, we recommend for this and future projects that:

"1. The Austin Chapter of the American Institute of Architects, the most competent professional group that we know, should be enlisted to assist the City Council and be asked to recommend when and if a plan is compatible with Austin's best development potential.

2. The City of Austin should do its own planning of Town Lake public lands and when it is determined that certain areas should be turned over to private development, the leases should be let only after competitive bidding.

"AUSTIN PARKS AND RECREATION BOARD

BY (Sgd) Mrs. Fagan Dickson
Chairman"

Councilman Long moved that the Little Texas Proposition be rejected and that this proposed lease be turned down. Councilman LaRue seconded the motion. In discussion Councilman LaRue said he had no indication there was any opposition of leasing public lands on Town Lake from anything said this afternoon-- certainly not by anything he had said. He stated he had pointed out the deficiencies and wanted to be certain there was no opportunity of anyone to misunderstand his feelings. The Mayor asked Mr. Cain if others were invited to submit proposals; and unless there were a complete set of detailed plans, if he would

be inclined to spend that much money for plans without having any more assurance that the Council would vote for any kind of a lease. Mr. Cain stated he would not. Mr. Swearingen asked for clarification of the motion. Councilman Long stated she was opposed to this project, and the one they have been talking about. If they get a piece of property way off somewhere and do not take up the Lake front, that would be fine. MR. MAROQUIN said this was an excellent project for the City, and people look upon the City as inviting business and industry; and the motion is to reject the proposition and the lease.

COUNCILMAN SHANKS made a substitute motion that the Parks and Recreation Board's recommendation be accepted. The motion was seconded by the Mayor. Three members of the Council objected to Mayor Palmer's seconding the motion.

Roll call on Councilman Long's motion that the Little Texas Proposition be rejected and that this proposed lease be turned down, showed the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, White
Noes: Councilman Shanks, Mayor Palmer

Councilman Long then moved that the City Council adopt the recommendation of the Parks and Recreation Board which says, "Since there are still so many unanswered questions concerning the Little Texas proposal, we recommend for this and future projects that:

"The Austin Chapter of the American Institute of Architects, the most competent professional group that we know, should be enlisted to assist the City Council and be asked to recommend when and if a plan is compatible with Austin's best development potential.

"The City of Austin should do its own planning of Town Lake public lands and when it is determined that certain areas should be turned over to private development, the leases should be let only after competitive bidding."

Councilman White seconded the motion.

Councilman Shanks moved that the motion be amended to include the entire recommendation. The motion lost for lack of a second.

Roll call on Councilman Long's motion showed the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, White
Noes: Councilman Shanks, Mayor Palmer

Mayor Palmer made the following statement:

"I would vote for the entire recommendation of the Parks and Recreation Board, but to pull a part of it out of context, I vote 'no'."

Mayor Palmer announced in light of this motion, there is no reason for having the public hearing Wednesday night.

May 19, 1966

The City Manager submitted the following:

"May 16, 1966

"Mr. W. T. Williams, Jr.
City Manager
Austin, Texas

"Dear Mr. Williams:

"Sealed bids were received until 11:00 A.M., Friday, May 13, 1966 at the office of the Director of the Water and Sewer Department for the installation of approximately 1160 FEET OF 10-INCH SANITARY SEWER APPROACH MAIN AND 2100 FEET OF 8-INCH SANITARY SEWER APPROACH MAIN FROM THE INTERSECTION OF HIGHLAND HILLS DRIVE AND SHADOW MOUNTAIN DRIVE TO NORTHWEST HILLS, SECTION 8, SUBDIVISION. The purpose of this project is to provide sanitary sewer service to Northwest Hills, Section 8 Subdivision and future subdivisions in the area along the route of this sanitary sewer approach main. The bids were publicly opened and read in the Second Floor Conference Room of the Municipal Building, Austin, Texas.

"The following is a tabulation of bids received:

<u>"Firm</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Working Days</u>
J. C. Evans Construction Company	\$26,032.40	50
Ford-Wehmeyer, Incorporated	39,987.45	60
Bland Construction Company	41,395.25	60
City of Austin (Estimate)	37,823.00	90

"It is recommended that the contract be awarded to the J. C. Evans Construction Company on their low bid of \$26,032.40 with 50 working days.

"Yours truly,
s/ Victor R. Schmidt, Jr.
Victor R. Schmidt, Jr. Director
Water and Sewer Department:

Councilman White offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:

(RESOLUTION)

WHEREAS, bids were received by the City of Austin on May 13, 1966, for the installation of approximately 1160 feet of 10-inch sanitary sewer approach main from the intersection of Highland Hills Drive and Shadow Mountain Drive to Northwest Hills, Section 8, Subdivision; and,

WHEREAS, the bid of J. C. Evans Construction Company, in the sum of \$26,032.40, was the lowest and best bid therefor, and the acceptance of such bid has been recommended by the Director of Water and Sewer Department of the City of Austin, and by the City Manager; Now, Therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN:

That the bid of J. C. Evans Construction Company, in the sum of \$26,032.40, be and the same is hereby accepted, and that W. T. Williams, Jr., City Manager of the City of Austin, be and he is hereby authorized to execute a contract, on behalf of the City with J. C. Evans Construction Company.

The motion, seconded by Councilman LaRue, carried by the following vote:
 Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
 Noes: None

The City Manager submitted the following:

"May 17, 1966

"TO: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council.

SUBJECT: Bids on Police Uniform Clothing.

"Sealed bids were opened in the office of the Purchasing Agent at 2:00 P.M. May 13, 1966 for the estimated requirements of Police Uniform Clothing for a period of twelve (12) months. This Uniform Clothing will be delivered to the Police Department as required during this period.

"Invitations to bid were advertised in the Austin American-Statesman on April 24 and May 1, 1966 and were sent to local distributors of uniforms of this type.

"The bids received are as follows:

		<u>Lorey's Custom Tailoring</u>	<u>Joseph's Men's Shop</u>	<u>Jorace, Inc.</u>
Ties	300 Ea.	\$ 225.00	\$ 210.00	\$ 183.00
Caps	250 Ea.	1,062.50	1,300.00	1,000.00
Summer Shirts	425 Ea.	1,806.25	2,112.25	1,636.25
Winter Shirts	425 Ea.	2,103.75	2,635.00	1,933.75
Trousers	300 Ea.	5,370.00	6,525.00	4,800.00
Jackets	12 Ea.	<u>357.00</u>	<u>351.00</u>	<u>276.00</u>
Net Total		\$10,924.50	\$13,133.25	\$9,829.00

"This tabulation is submitted with the apparent low bid meeting the City of Austin specifications and conditions underscored.

Councilman Long offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:

(RESOLUTION)

WHEREAS, bids were received by the City of Austin on May 13, 1966 for the estimated requirements of Police Uniform Clothing for a period of twelve (12) months; and,

May 19, 1966

WHEREAS, the total bid of Jorace, Inc., in the sum of \$9,829.00, was the lowest and best bid therefor, and the acceptance of such bid has been recommended by the Purchasing Agent of the City of Austin, and by the City Manager; Now, Therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN:

That the total bid of Jorace, Inc., in the sum of \$9,829.00, be and the same is hereby accepted, and that W. T. Williams, Jr., City Manager of the City of Austin be, and he is hereby authorized to execute a contract, on behalf of the City, with Jorace, Inc.

The motion, seconded by Councilman White, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer

Noes: None

The City Manager submitted the following:

"May 17, 1966

BID TABULATION SHEET
ELECTRIC BUILDING
CITY OF AUSTIN
AUSTIN, TEXAS

BARTON D. RILEY & ASSOCIATES
KUEHNE AND TURLEY
ASSOCIATED ARCHITECTS

CONTRACTOR	GENERAL CONSTRUCTION BASE BID	GENERAL HEATING, CONSTRUC-VENTILAT- TION ING, AIR COMBINA- CONDITION- TION BID ING & PLUMB- ING BASE BID	ELECTRICAL CONSTRUCTION BASE BID	ADDEN- DUM	CASHIER'S CHECK OR BID BOND
C & H CON- STRUCTION CO.	331,358	365		Low Combina- tion Bid 477,425	
J. C. EVANS CONSTRUCTION CO.	345,691	265			
FAULKNER CONSTRUCTION CO.	341,891	380			
ROBERT C. GRAY CONSTRUCTION CO.	342,330	358			
KITCHENS CONSTRUCTION CO.	389,311	360			
B.L. McGEE CONSTRUCTION CO.	- - - -				
RICKS CONSTRUC- TION CO.	335,400	245			
*J. C. PETERSON CONST. CO.	287,000	300			

May 19, 1966

CONTRACTOR	GENERAL CONSTRUC- TION BASE BID	GENERAL CONSTRUC- TION COM- BINATION BID	HEATING, VENTILATING, AIR CONDITION- ING & PLUMBING BASE BID	ELECTRICAL CONSTRUCTION BASE BID	ADDEN- DUM	CASHIER'S CHECK OR BID BOND
AIR CONDITION- ING, INC.			- - -			
J. M. BOYER			138,611			
FOX AND HEARN			144,841			
C.G. PURYEAR			- - -			
*YOUNG AND PRATT			<u>130,640</u>			
E & W PLUMBING & HEATING CO.			141,763			
AA ELECTRIC				62,543		
*AHR ELECTRIC				<u>59,785</u>		
O. H. CUMMINS				64,102		
W. K. JENNINGS				64,778		
WALTER JOHNSON				60,885		
DEAN JOHNSTON				- - -		
FOX SCHMIDT				61,000		
WILKINS ELECTRIC				- - -		

"MAY 18, 1966

"Mr. W. T. Williams, Jr.

City Manager Austin, Texas

"Re: Acceptance of Bids, Electric Building for the City of Austin.

"Dear Mr. Williams:

"Attached please find the completed bid tabulation sheet for the above referenced work.

"As noted, the lowest combination of General and Mechanical and Electrical bids totals four hundred seventy-seven thousand, four hundred twenty-five dollars and no cents (\$477,425.00). The job breakdown is as follows:

General Construction

J. C. Peterson Construction Company \$287,000.00

Mechanical Construction

Young & Pratt \$130,000.00

"Electrical Construction
Ahr Electric

\$59,785.00

"This office, together with Kuehne & Turley, Associated Architects, find the total combination of bids to be below the final estimate and acceptable to us. We therefore recommend the awarding of the Contracts on the Electric Building for the City of Austin to the aforementioned Contractors.

"Respectfully Submitted,

Approved:

s/ Barton D. Riley
Barton D. Riley

D. C. KINNEY

A. M. ELDRIDGE"

Councilman Long noted the actual bid was \$130,640.00. The City Manager stated the report from the Architect had the figure of \$130,000. The Mayor stated the contract could be awarded at \$130,000; and if there were an error, it could be corrected. Councilman White offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:

(RESOLUTION)

WHEREAS, bids were received by the City of Austin on May 17, 1966, for construction of an Electric Building; and,

WHEREAS, the combined bid of J. C. Peterson Construction Company, in the sum of \$287,000.00 for general construction, of Young & Pratt in the sum of \$130,640.00*for mechanical construction, and of Ahr Electric in the sum of \$59,785.00 for electrical construction, was the lowest and best bid therefor, and the acceptance of such combined bid has been recommended by the Director of Electric Distribution of the City of Austin, and by the City Manager; Now, Therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN:

That the bids of J. C. Peterson Construction Company, Young & Pratt and Ahr Electric, be and the same are hereby accepted, and that W. T. Williams, Jr., City Manager of the City of Austin be, and he is hereby authorized to execute contracts, on behalf of the City, with J. C. Peterson Construction Company, Young & Pratt and Ahr Electric in the sums recited above.

The motion, seconded by Councilman Shanks, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer

Noes: None

*Corrected by Minutes of June 9, 1966.

The City Manager submitted the following:

TABLATION OF BIDS
POLICE ASSOCIATION BUILDING
BID OPENING - May 17, 1966

May 19, 1966

<u>BIDDERS</u>	<u>BASE BID</u>	<u>TIME</u> <u>(Calendar Days)</u>	<u>BID BOND</u>
A. W. Bryant Construction Co.	\$23,787	120	5%
Frank R. Rundell Co., Inc.	\$24,566	90	5%
Floyd Gibson	\$25,784	150	5%
Joe Badgett Construction Co.	\$26,403	100	5%
S & G Construction Company	\$27,642	110	5%

"May 17, 1966

"TO: Mr. W. T. Williams, Jr., City Manager SUBJECT: Police Association Building
Tabulation of Bids

"Tabulation of bids for construction of the Police Association Building is attached hereto.

"We join with Mr. Sheffield in recommending that the contract be awarded to the low bidder, A. W. BRYANT CONSTRUCTION COMPANY for the lump sum of \$23,787.00.

"The scheduled completion date is approximately September 19, 1965.

"FROM A. M. Eldridge, Supervising Engineer
Construction Engineering Division

s/ A. M. Eldridge"

The Recreation Director stated his department was developing this property to fit in with their program. The City Manager pointed out the Police Association was operating two Little Leagues on City owned property, (the Vocational School tract), and this was the tract the Schools needed for a new Junior High School to replace University Junior High School. The City had an agreement with the Schools that it could have the north half of this Vocational School Tract for a school site in exchange of property which the schools would pay for. The City was to pay for the relocation of the Police Little League. They have a nice building between the two fields at the present time and since they were being dispossessed, it was agreed the City would replace the building. Councilman LaRue offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:

(RESOLUTION)

WHEREAS, bids were received by the City of Austin on May 17, 1966 for construction of the Police Association Building; and,

WHEREAS, the bid of A. W. Bryant Construction Company, in the lump sum of \$23,787.00, was the lowest and best bid therefor, and the acceptance of such bid has been recommended by the Supervising Engineer, Construction Engineering Division of the City of Austin, and by the City Manager; Now, Therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN:

That the bid of A. W. Bryant Construction Company, in the lump sum of \$23,787.00, be and the same is hereby accepted, and that W. T. Williams, Jr., City Manager of the City of Austin, be and he is hereby authorized to execute a contract, on behalf of the City, with A. W. Bryant Construction Company.

The motion, seconded by Councilman Long, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer

Noes: None

Mayor Palmer introduced the following ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO ENTER INTO A CERTAIN CONTRACT WITH PRINGLE REAL ESTATE, INCORPORATED FOR THE APPROPRIATION OF MONEY PAID TO THE CITY OF AUSTIN UNDER SUCH CONTRACT; AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY.

The ordinance was read the first time and Councilman White moved that the rule be suspended and the ordinance passed to its second reading. The motion, seconded by Councilman LaRue, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer

Noes: None

The ordinance was read the second time and Councilman White moved that the rule be suspended and the ordinance passed to its third reading. The motion, seconded by Councilman LaRue, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer

Noes: None

The ordinance was read the third time and Councilman White moved that the ordinance be finally passed. The motion, seconded by Councilman LaRue, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer

Noes: None

The Mayor announced that the ordinance had been finally passed.

Mayor Palmer introduced the following ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO ENTER INTO A CERTAIN CONTRACT WITH MORTGAGE INVESTMENT CORPORATION FOR THE APPROPRIATION OF MONEY PAID TO THE CITY OF AUSTIN UNDER SUCH CONTRACT; AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY.

The ordinance was read the first time and Councilman White moved that the rule be suspended and the ordinance passed to its second reading. The motion, seconded by Councilman LaRue, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer

Noes: None

The ordinance was read the second time and Councilman White moved that the rule be suspended and the ordinance passed to its third reading. The motion, seconded by Councilman LaRue, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

The ordinance was read the third time and Councilman White moved that the ordinance be finally passed. The motion, seconded by Councilman LaRue, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

The Mayor announced that the ordinance had been finally passed.

Mayor Palmer introduced the following ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR THE EXTENSION OF CERTAIN BOUNDARY LIMITS OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN AND THE ANNEXATION OF CERTAIN ADDITIONAL TERRITORY CONSISTING OF (1) 31.60 ACRES OF LAND OUT OF THE JAMES P. WALLACE SURVEY NUMBER 18, AND (2) 5.16 ACRES OF LAND SAME BEING THREE UNPLATTED TRACTS OF LAND OUT OF THE JAMES P. WALLACE SURVEY NUMBER 18, IN TRAVIS COUNTY, TEXAS; WHICH SAID ADDITIONAL TERRITORY LIES ADJACENT TO AND ADJOINS THE PRESENT BOUNDARY LIMITS OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN, IN PARTICULARS STATED IN THE ORDINANCE.
(Westover Hills, Section 3)

Councilman LaRue moved that the ordinance be published in accordance with Article 1, Section 6 of the Charter of the City of Austin and set for public hearing on June 2, 1966, at 10:30 A.M. The motion, seconded by Councilman White, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

Councilman LaRue moved that the Council accept the recommendation of the City Manager and grant GLASTRON BOAT COMPANY permission to display boats on Town Lake on July 31st and August 1st, to exhibit their boats at two locations--displaying the boats by the Crest Hotel from 9:00 A.M. - 12 noon and from 5:00 P.M. - 10:00 P.M. moving them down to Fiesta Gardens. The motion, seconded by Councilman Long, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

The City Manager made a report on the application for Federal funds in the form of a grant to aid in the construction of Water Treatment Plant No. 3, which will be let for bids about July 1st. After the preliminary application was filed, the City then was said to be eligible. Then an elaborate set of plans and a formal application for \$1,500,000 were filed. Mr. Ullrich, Mr. Schmidt, and the

consulting engineer, Mr. Curington, and he went to Fort Worth for a pre-conference with the Public Facilities Administration. The Planner reviewing the application reported under the last Housing Urban Law, no Federal aid on this project, any other public facility project, or any new open space applications would be approved unless the City had initiated a Regional Planning Commission. They concluded Travis County would be a satisfactory region in which Austin would participate rather than a 7 or 8 county region. It was explained that not all the political subdivisions in the County join, but it would be necessary that they all be permitted to if they so desired. The planning would be purely comprehensive planning. It was recognized also that the City almost had planned the whole area already; and from the point of view of the long range water and sewer plans, the City had just about planned the entire County. The recommendation was not so much a new plan, but the setting up of the mechanics to provide for future planning. It would give what already had been done a regional status to comply with the Federal regulations. The City Manager read from the San Antonio Plan, which the group at the Public Facilities Administration had said was acceptable; "The Plan and recommendation of the Commission may be adopted in whole or part by the respective governing bodies of the cooperating governmental units. The Commission may assist the participating governmental units individually or collectively in carrying out any plans or recommendations developed by the Commission. The Commission may assist any participating governmental unit individually in the preparation or effectuation of local planning consistent with the general purpose of the Commission." The Public Facilities Administration said in the case of Austin in their opinion, the logical way to proceed, would be the designation of the Planning Commission as the staff for the Regional Commission. What is required is what the City is already doing it seems. They advise setting up a plan by participation by all of the other agencies. It is not necessary that the other agencies join, as long as it is offered to them. The Governmental Fiscal year ends June 30, and any money committed out of this year's appropriation must be committed before that time, and the application has to be reviewed in Fort Worth and in Washington. The time is short, and it is urgent to get this under way. The City Manager listed the suggested membership of the Regional Commission. The City Manager discussed the Executive Committee, and its selection by the Commission from the representatives appointed by the various governing entities, plus the four ex-officio members, the Director of Public Works and the Directors of the three Utilities. Dues, based on the last census will be \$3700.80 for the City. The over all plan will be available for any governmental unit to use if it desires, and it can adopt it or not, or adopt it in part. The City would be free in determining what it wanted to do any time in the future.

Councilman LaRue moved to accept the recommendation and adopt the agreement for the Regional Planning Commission. The motion, seconded by Councilman Long, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

(Agreement Adopted)

"AGREEMENT FOR REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

"THE STATE OF TEXAS

KNOWN ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENTS THAT:

COUNTY OF TRAVIS

"WHEREAS, the 59th Texas Legislature enacted House Bill 319 (Art. 1011m, V.A.T.S.) to authorize counties, cities, towns and other political subdivisions

"of this State to establish regional planning commissions; and,

"WHEREAS, pursuant thereto, it is the purpose and desire of the undersigned political subdivisions located within the County of Travis to provide for a regional planning commission for said area; Now, Therefore,

"It is agreed between the parties hereto, the undersigned political subdivisions of the County of Travis, to create the Austin-Travis County Organization for Regional Planning, under the authority of Art. 1011m, V.A.T.S., pursuant to the following provisions:

"SECTION 1. DEFINITIONS. As used herein, the following terms shall have the meanings shown thereafter.

"A. "City" means any incorporated city, town or village in Travis County, Texas.

"B. "Governmental Unit" means any city, town, village, independent school district, water control and improvement district, or other governmental entity of the State of Texas, wholly or partially within the bounds of Travis County.

"C. "Commission" means the Regional Planning Commission for Travis County created under authority of H.B. 319 as passed by the 59th Legislature (Art. 1011m, V.A.T.S.).

"D. "Regional, Area or Regional" means the geographic area of Travis County, Texas.

"SECTION 2. NAME. The name of this planning organization shall be the Austin-Travis County Organization (for) Regional Planning (ATCORP).

"SECTION 3. THE PLANNING REGION DEFINED. The planning region shall consist of all of the geographic area of Travis County.

"SECTION 4. OBJECTIVES. The purpose of the Regional Planning Commission is to encourage and permit units of government in Travis County to join and to cooperate with one another in planning for the purpose of improving the health, safety and general welfare of its citizens, by planning for the future development of communities, areas and regions to the end that transportation system may be more carefully planned; that communities and areas of the region grow with adequate street, utility, health, educational, recreational, and other essential facilities; that the needs of agriculture, business, and industry be recognized; that residential areas provide healthy surroundings for family life; that historical and cultural values be preserved; and that the growth of the communities, areas, and regions be commensurate with the promotive of the efficient and economical use of public funds. Because of urban growth and development in metropolitan areas, problems have arisen and will continue to arise which so transcend the boundary line of local governmental units that no single unit can make plans for their solution without affecting other units in Travis County.

"SECTION 5. DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION.

"A. The general purpose of the Commission is to make studies and plans to guide the unified, far-reaching development of the area, to eliminate duplication, and to promote economy and efficiency in the coordinated development of the area. The Commission may make plans for the development of the area which may

include recommendations on major thoroughfares, streets, traffic and transportation studies, bridges, airports, parks, recreation sites, school sites, public utilities, land use, water supply, sanitation facilities, drainage, public buildings, population density, open spaces, and other items relating to the effectuation of the general purpose.

"B. The plans and recommendations of the Commission may be adopted in whole or in part by the respective governing bodies of the cooperating governmental units. The Commission may assist the participating governmental units individually or collectively in carrying out any plans or recommendations developed by the Commission. The Commission may assist any participating governmental unit individually in the preparation or effectuation of local planning consistent with the general purpose of the Commission.

"SECTION 6. MEMBERSHIP.

"A. Membership of the Commission shall consist of the following representatives:

"1. One representative appointed by the governing body of each city, town, or village in Travis County other than Austin.

"2. Five representatives appointed by Commissioners' Court of Travis County.

"3. One representative appointed by the governing board of each independent school district in Travis County other than the Austin Independent School District.

"4. Seven representatives appointed by the governing board of the Austin Independent School District.

"5. One member from each water control and improvement district appointed by the body governing such district.

"6. Five members to be appointed by the City Council of the City of Austin.

"7. The Director of Public Works of the City of Austin.

"8. The Director of Electric Utilities of the City of Austin.

"9. The Director of Water & Sewer Distribution of the City of Austin.

"10. The Director of Water & Sewer Treatment of the City of Austin.

"B. Each governmental unit shall be eligible for representation only while remaining active in membership through payment of membership dues.

"C. Each member of the Commission shall be entitled to one vote.

"SECTION 7. TERMS OF MEMBERS. The terms of members of the Commission who are elected officials shall run concurrently with their terms of elective office in their respective governmental units. Members of the Commission who are officials of the various governmental units and who are appointed to serve the respective governmental units, shall serve at the pleasure of the elected governing body of the respective governmental units.

"SECTION 8. DUES.

"A. Membership dues of governmental units who become members of the Regional Planning Commission shall be as follows:

"1. Cities, towns and villages shall pay annual dues based on \$0.02 per capita of their population, based on the last preceding Federal census.

"2. Travis County shall pay annual dues of \$0.01 per capita of population based on the last preceding Federal census.

"3. All other members shall pay annual dues of \$100.

"B. Each member shall pay an amount equal to one year's dues to the Director of Finance of the City of Austin within 30 days from the date hereof, who shall make such funds available to the Executive Committee upon its organization. The Executive Committee may designate some other person to receive the dues required herein. Effective with 1967, annual dues shall be due January 31 of each calendar year.

"SECTION 9. ORGANIZATION, MEETINGS AND DUTIES OF THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION.

"A. The Regional Planning Commission as a whole shall elect a Chairman and Vice Chairman from among its members to serve for a period of one year. The Chairman shall preside at all meetings of the Commission. The Vice Chairman shall preside in the absence of the Chairman.

"B. The Commission as a whole shall meet twice each year at a time and place as decided upon by the Commission.

"C. The Chairman of the Commission may call a special meeting of the Commission when he deems necessary. The Chairman of the Commission shall call a special meeting at the request of the Executive Committee. The Secretary shall give written notice of each meeting.

"D. A simple majority of the members present at any meeting will be necessary for the conduct of business.

"E. Commission members shall serve without pay.

"F. The Commission as a whole shall be responsible for the general review of the operations of the Commission and advise the Executive Committee on general policy. The Commission as a whole shall review and approve all regional plans as developed by the Executive Committee.

"G. The Director of Planning of the City of Austin shall serve as the Commission's Acting Secretary until permanent arrangements can be made for performance of the Commission's planning functions.

"H. The Director of Finance of the City of Austin shall serve as the Commission's Acting Treasurer until permanent arrangements can be made for performance of the Commission's financial functions.

"SECTION 10. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP. There shall be an Executive Committee, which shall serve as the Administrative Committee and Governing Body for the Commission, consisting of the following members of the Commission:

- "1. Two members elected by the five County members.
 - "2. Two members elected by the five members appointed by the City Council of the City of Austin.
 - "3. One member elected by the members of the Commission from incorporated cities, towns or villages, other than Austin.
 - "4. One member elected by the members of the Commission from the water control and improvement districts.
 - "5. One member elected by the members of the Commission from the independent school districts other than Austin.
 - "6. One member elected by the seven Austin Independent School District members.
 - "7. The four Directors ex officio from the City of Austin.
- "The members of the Executive Committee shall serve at the pleasure of the Commission members authorized to appoint them.

"SECTION 11. MEETINGS AND DUTIES OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

"A. The Executive Committee shall elect from its members a Chairman and a Vice Chairman who will serve for a period of one year. Should a vacancy occur in the Chairmanship or Vice Chairmanship of the Executive Committee the office shall be filled from members of the Executive Committee. The Chairman of the Executive Committee shall preside at its meetings. The Vice Chairman shall preside in the absence of the Chairman.

"B. The Executive Committee shall meet once each month or upon call by its Chairman, at a time and place as designated by the Executive Committee.

"C. The Executive Committee shall be responsible for the adoption of a budget with the approval of the Commission as a whole.

"D. The Executive Committee, as the Administrative and Governing Body of the Commission, is authorized on its own motion to exercise the following duties:

"1. The Executive Committee shall determine the various regional plans to be developed by the Commission.

"2. The Executive Committee may contract with private firms and/or governmental units, including members, to perform any of the Commission's planning functions.

"3. The Executive Committee may appoint an administrative staff to perform any of the Commission's planning functions.

"4. The Executive Committee is authorized to contract with member governmental units for the performance of planning functions for said units at an agreed charge, including planning which is done on less than a region-wide basis.

"5. The Executive Committee shall be responsible for the receipt, disbursement, and accounting for all funds of the Commission.

"6. The Executive Committee is authorized to apply for, contract for, receive and expend for its purposes any funds or grants from any participating governmental unit for from the State of Texas, Federal Government, or any other source.

"7. The Executive Committee shall provide for an independent audit annually by auditors appointed by the Commission.

"8. Any person entrusted with the handling of funds shall be bonded in such amount as the Commission may require.

"SECTION 12. CREATION OF A REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION. Execution of this agreement shall be authorized by order, resolution or ordinance of the governing bodies of the respective governmental units that are to be represented on the Commission. Governmental units eligible for membership pursuant hereto, which are not among the original signatories, may execute this agreement and designate representatives subject to the provisions herein.

EXECUTED this day of , 1966, pursuant to order duly adopted by the City Council of the City of Austin.

CITY OF AUSTIN

BY _____
City Manager

ATTEST:

City Clerk

EXECUTED this day of , 1966, pursuant to order duly adopted by the Commissioners' Court of Travis County, Texas.

COUNTY OF TRAVIS

BY _____
County Judge

ATTEST:

County Clerk"

The City Attorney reviewed the value of the Rimrock Trail properties, which the City owns. The City Manager suggested taking the map and reviewing the lots on the ground.

The City Manager stated there was pending consideration of appraising a strip of land between Buford Stewart's land and Ben White Boulevard. The City Attorney said their work was not quite finished although they had hoped to have it ready for the Council today.

May 19, 1966

Councilman Long inquired about some property on Parkway owned by Mrs. Roland Freund. The City Attorney stated they were in the process of condemning this property and had an agreement from her attorney that the City will have possession of the premises whether they are able to agree on the value or not. He said they were still negotiating. Councilman Shanks stated they are supposed to vacate by June 15th, and nothing has been done about it. Discussion was held on four appraisals made by Mr. Kendall's appraisers, and those made by three appraisers for the City. The City Attorney stated they were trying to use the same yard stick in dealing with all the property owners in that area. The Mayor stated the Council should look at the maps and appraisals.

Mayor Palmer filed letters addressed to the Council regarding "Little Texas" as follows:

- | | |
|--|--|
| MRS. WELDON D. LAMB | - expressing need of the attraction of Little Texas to bring the family to the City, and to provide employment to the young people. |
| WILLIAM GOSSETT | - if property arrangements are worked out, such a development would be for the good of the economy of Austin. |
| EDWIN B. FULLER | - objected to leasing to Little Texas (based mainly on provisions of the lease) |
| JOE MANOR, Chairman
Greater Austin Ass'n. | - asked that no action be taken on May 19th until further study by the Council, and that the Council study further the proposal and take action thereon only after detailed study has been made. |
| WILMA WILLIAMS | - approved granting Little Texas to operate the project proposed on Town Lake. |
| ALVIN A. BURGER | - asked the Council to decide against leasing any of the land bordering Town Lake for Little Texas or any other project which would interfere with preserving that land as a beautified public domain. |
| MRS. HELEN G. SMITH | - opposed to leasing, and suggested normal business like returns on leases. |
| WILLIAM E. ROTH | - questioned the riparian rights of the citizens on the navigable stream. |

MAYOR PALMER read a letter from the Regional Administrator Department of Housing and Urban Development that the Workable Program for Community Improvement of the City of Austin for a period ending June 1, 1967 has been approved. The letter set out the Requirements for Recertification. The City Manager stated the major item listed was relocation, and the City has been asked to go beyond its commitment and set up a central relocation office. Except for that, everything else is material which the City was to complete in 1966--certain ordinances which were in the making, and a revision of the plan for code enforcement and updating. Councilman Long asked that copies of this letter be sent to the Council.

May 19, 1966

MAYOR PALMER read a letter from MR. ED BLUESTEIN thanking the Council, Administration and Austin Citizens, in bestowing a great honor upon him. (Naming Loop 111 ED BLUESTEIN BOULEVARD)

MAYOR PALMER had a letter from MERLE A. SIMPSON, Architect, stating his firm would like to be considered on any project the City contemplates in the future.

The Mayor read a letter noting Austin had the distinction of being the only city in the world lighted by artificial moonlight, and Austin is known as the most gracious host. They had been extended all the benefits of this great city, and had enjoyed a most delightful sojourn, the Seratoma.

MAYOR PALMER said Mr. Victor Sumner, Austin Good Neighbor Commission was sending invitations to the Council Members to attend the reception of the Belo Horizonte visitors, Sunday, May 22, at 1410 Ethridge.

MAYOR PALMER read a letter from Theodore Anderson who had signed a petition asking the name of the Carver Branch Library be retained but he now is asking that his name be removed from that petition. The City Manager stated the present thinking of the Library Commission and the Library Staff is that the Carver Branch not be closed.

The Council postponed decision on the following zoning application:

CITY OF AUSTIN	1600-1706 East 51st Street	From "A" Residence
	5100-5132 Berkman Drive	To "GR" General Retail
		(or any more restrictive district)
		RECOMMENDED "BB" Residence by the Planning Commission

There being no further business, Councilman LaRue moved that the Council adjourn. The motion, seconded by Councilman Shanks, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

The Council adjourned at 7:00 P.M. subject to the call of the Mayor.

APPROVED


Mayor

ATTEST:


City Clerk